

1 FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE BOARD
2
3 RURAL DETERMINATION PROCESS PUBLIC COMMENT
4
5 BEFORE HEARING OFFICER
6 TOM KRON
7
8
9 Dillingham Borough Chambers
10 October 29, 2013
11 7:00 p.m.
12
13
14 HEARING OFFICER
15 TOM KRON
16
17
18 Presenter: Trevor Fox
19 Office of Subsistence Management
20
21 Charlie Brower, Federal Subsistence Board Member
22
23
24
25
26
27
28 Recorded and transcribed by:
29 Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC
30 135 Christensen Drive, Second Floor
31 Anchorage, AK 99501
32 907-243-0668/sahile@gci.net

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

P R O C E E D I N G S

(Dillingham, Alaska - 10/29/2013)

(On record)

MR. KRON: Okay. We're going to start. Welcome all. This is the Federal Subsistence Board public hearing for the rural determination process and I will be your hearing officer here today. I wanted to welcome all the Council members and tribal leaders and participants here in the community of Dillingham. We wanted to thank everyone for coming.

This is an opportunity for you to provide input to the Federal Subsistence Board rural determination process. This meeting will focus only on the how, not the what or the focus of what areas in Alaska would be determined to be nonrural. It's just about how they get there. The Board has been accepting comments through November 1, but my understanding is that they've submitted a proposal to change this to December 2nd and hopefully we will hear on this revision tomorrow. So stay tuned, but regardless your comments tonight will definitely be included into the process.

Tonight will be an opportunity for you to provide both oral and written comments. My name is Tom Kron. I'm a division chief with the Office of Subsistence Management in Anchorage. Tonight I'm here as your so my job is to make sure everyone here who would like to make oral or written comments on this process is able to do so. This meeting has been scheduled to last until 9:00 o'clock tonight in order to receive your comments. We have a court reporter here. She will be taking your comments and they will be transcribed.

During the public comment portion of the meeting we will not be answering questions. We're here to listen. We're here to learn. Again, the focus tonight is on how this process should be done, how it should be conducted, not what the decision should be. These kind of meetings are being scheduled around the state associated with the Regional Advisory Council meetings and there will be several others in addition.

Because of the importance of your comments, we will follow certain procedures during the

1 meeting. As you enter the room -- I think most of you
2 are already seated -- please sign in on the sign-in
3 sheet so we know who's here. It's important that
4 everybody present here sign in so we have a complete
5 record. Again, use some care when you spell out your
6 name so we can actually read all the letters. If you
7 plan to make oral comments tonight, please fill out a
8 speaking card like this. Kathy has a number of them.

9
10 As I'm talking here for the next couple
11 minutes, if you could go ahead and fill out those
12 cards, then I will read from those and ask you to come
13 up and speak. Also if you're attending this meeting or
14 submitting comments on behalf of a group or
15 organization, please indicate the name of the group or
16 entity that you represent.

17
18 Let me emphasize that the principal
19 purpose of the public hearing part of this meeting is
20 to receive information and comments from you on the
21 record. Please limit your comments, but keep it
22 focused on all the items that you wish to say. Again,
23 we will potentially be able to take comments until
24 9:00, so I think we'll be just fine.

25
26 Again, the deadline that we currently
27 have is November 1, but because of the government
28 shutdown this fall there has been a request submitted
29 to extend this through December 2nd. We will hear on
30 this tomorrow.

31
32 Board member Charlie Brower from Barrow
33 has come down to be with us here at the Regional
34 Council meeting and he has also agreed to sit up here
35 with me to take your comments. So we look forward to
36 hearing from you. Trevor Fox has a PowerPoint
37 presentation he's going to go through and we'll let
38 everybody know a little bit more about the rural
39 determination process and then there will be an
40 opportunity to answer some questions after that.

41
42 Then after that we will take public
43 comments.

44
45 MR. FOX: Good evening, everybody. I'm
46 Trevor Fox with the Federal Subsistence Management
47 Program. This includes the Fish and Wildlife Service,
48 the Forest Service, National Park Service, Bureau of
49 Indian Affairs and the Bureau of Land Management. The
50 program is responsible for managing subsistence on

1 Federal public lands in Alaska. I hear a couple people
2 on teleconference. For those of you following on the
3 teleconference, this PowerPoint that we're going over
4 could be found at the following web address. It's a
5 bit of a long one, but it's
6 [http://www.doi.gov/subsistence/library/policies/rural-](http://www.doi.gov/subsistence/library/policies/rural-determination.cfm)
7 [determination.cfm](http://www.doi.gov/subsistence/library/policies/rural-determination.cfm). I know that's a lot to take on. If
8 anybody needs me to repeat that, I guess I could say it
9 one more time here.

10

11 I'm here to explain this process and
12 talk about how you can be part of the process we're
13 currently under. I'll start by summarizing the actions
14 that brought us here, some background on the Federal
15 rural determination process, how the current process
16 works and I'll describe the criteria that are currently
17 used to describe an area as rural or nonrural status.
18 All the information and steps are available to you and
19 I'll let you know where you can find the resources and
20 then talk about how you can provide your ideas to
21 improve the process.

22

23 In 2010 the Secretaries of the Interior
24 and Agriculture directed the Federal Subsistence Board
25 to conduct a review of the process that is used in
26 making rural and nonrural determinations to see if the
27 methods being used are relevant and current. The
28 Federal Subsistence Board is seeking public input,
29 recommendations by the Regional Advisory Councils, and
30 also input from tribes and ANCSA corporations through
31 consultations. The Federal Subsistence Board may
32 develop recommendations for improving the process based
33 on these public comments and that recommendation if
34 it's made by the Board would then go to the Secretaries
35 of Interior and Agriculture.

36

37 For some background, Title VIII of
38 ANILCA is the legislation which provides a subsistence
39 priority for rural Alaska residents to harvest fish and
40 wildlife on Federal public lands. Only those residents
41 of rural areas are eligible for subsistence priority on
42 Federal public land. In this map here, you can see the
43 green areas on the map. That's the extent of Federal
44 public lands within Alaska

45

46 Senate Report No. 96-413, which
47 comments on Title VIII, provided examples of cities
48 excluded from rural status and these were Ketchikan,
49 Juneau, Anchorage and Fairbanks. It also provided
50 examples of communities that are rural, such as

1 Dillingham, Bethel, Nome, Kotzebue, Barrow and other
2 Native and non-Native villages scattered throughout the
3 state.

4
5 Court decisions limit how rural is
6 defined. The Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals determined
7 that rural refers to a sparsely populated area and is
8 not primarily about the subsistence lifestyle or an
9 area's use of fish and wildlife resources.

10
11 The Circuit Court noted that Congress
12 did not limit the benefits of the statute, which is
13 ANILCA, to residents of areas dominated by a
14 subsistence economy. Instead, Congress wrote broadly
15 giving the statutory priority to all subsistence users
16 residing in rural areas.

17
18 You can see on this slide most of
19 Alaska is considered rural. Those would be the gray
20 areas, with the black areas being non-rural areas.

21
22 This slide shows the relative
23 population size of various cities in rural areas. As
24 of 2000, really small text here, but the top areas with
25 the gray, the top four areas, those are nonrural areas,
26 and then you see further down Dillingham, where we're
27 currently at, is the third from the bottom and it's
28 quite a bit smaller than some of the rural areas.

29
30 So this is the current process used for
31 rural determinations and I'll give an overview of each
32 of these. The first criteria I'm going to go over is
33 grouping or aggregation of communities. The Federal
34 Subsistence Board recognizes that communities and areas
35 of Alaska are connected in diverse ways. Regulations
36 require communities that are economically, socially and
37 communally integrated to be considered in the aggregate
38 or grouped together in determining rural and nonrural
39 status.

40
41 The grouping used by the Board is as
42 follows: Do 30 percent or more of working people
43 commute from one community to another. Do they share a
44 common high school attendance area and are the
45 communities in proximity and road accessible to one
46 another.

47
48 So the Board has developed a series of
49 questions to get your ideas on each one of these
50 criteria or portions of the criteria. As far as the

1 grouping and aggregation, are these criteria useful
2 for determining rural and nonrural status. If not,
3 please provide ideas on how to better indicate how
4 communities are integrated for the purposes of
5 determining rural and nonrural status. These questions
6 will be discussed a little bit later too and will be
7 included in some of the handouts in the room.

8

9 The second part of the process is
10 population threshold. The Federal Subsistence Board
11 currently uses several guidelines to determine whether
12 a specific area of Alaska is rural. One guideline sets
13 population thresholds after communities are grouped
14 together. A community or area with a population below
15 2,500 will be presumed rural. A community or area with
16 a population between 2,500 and 7,000 is not presumed
17 rural or nonrural. Other characteristics are used to
18 determine the rural status. Then communities with
19 populations above 7,000 are presumed non-rural.

20

21 Again, there's a question that goes
22 along with this, are these population threshold
23 guideline useful for determining whether a specific
24 area of Alaska is rural. If not, please provide
25 population sizes to distinguish between rural and
26 nonrural areas and the reasons for the population size
27 you believe more accurately reflects rural and nonrural
28 areas in Alaska.

29

30 When looking at rural characteristics,
31 the Board recognizes that population alone is not the
32 only indicator of a rural or nonrural status. Other
33 characteristics the Board considers include, but are
34 not limited to the following: the use of fish and
35 wildlife, development and diversity of the economy,
36 community infrastructure, transportation and
37 educational institutions. Again, the Board seeks your
38 ideas on rural characteristics. Are these
39 characteristics useful for determining whether a
40 specific area of Alaska is rural. If not, please
41 provide a list of characteristics that better define
42 rural and nonrural status.

43

44 Timelines and information sources are
45 related criteria. The Board performs its review based
46 on a 10-year census cycle and uses census information
47 for a snapshot of communities. Current regulations
48 state that population data from the most recent census
49 conducted by the U.S. Census Bureau as updated by the
50 Alaska Department of Labor shall be used in the rural

1 determination process.

2

3

4 The information collected and the
5 reports generated from the census varies between each
6 census cycle and because of that data used during the
7 Board's rural determination may vary. Some of the
8 information the Board used in past rural determinations
9 is no longer collected by the U.S. Census Bureau.

10

11 So the question the Board asks is
12 should the Board review rural determinations on a 10-
13 year cycle and if so, why, and if not, why not. The
14 information sources as stated in the regulations will
15 continue to be the foundation of data used for rural
16 determinations. Do you have any additional sources you
17 think would be beneficial to use.

18

19 Then there's sort of the open-ended
20 question, do you have any additional comments on how to
21 make the rural determination process more effective.
22 The Board will use public comments to assist in making
23 recommendations to the Secretaries regarding the scope
24 and nature of possible changes to improve the rural
25 determination process.

26

27 There are several sources of
28 information available in the handouts we have available
29 in the room. I encourage everyone to pick up copies.
30 Some of these resources are the website. You can also
31 email information and we've provided a phone number
32 here. All this can be located on our website and on
33 the handouts here.

34

35 So how can you provide comments on this
36 process. This hearing is one of the venues where you
37 can submit comments to inform the Federal Subsistence
38 Board. Also the Regional Advisory Council meetings.
39 This will be coming up again tomorrow and there will be
40 another opportunity. Comments can be submitted
41 electronically by email at subsistence@fws.gov. You
42 can also send comments by mail or hand deliver to the
43 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Office of Subsistence
44 Management, and that's at
45 1011 Tudor Road, Mail Stop 121, Anchorage, AK 99503.
46 And you can hand deliver these to a designated Federal
47 official, Council coordinator or any Federal official
48 attending any of the Regional Advisory Councils or
49 Federal Subsistence Board public meetings.

50

So thank you. I've tried to explain

1 why we're here asking all these questions and to give
2 you some background about the rural determination
3 process and how decisions are made. Now knowing the
4 questions to address, having resources at your
5 fingertips and the knowledge about how you can provide
6 your ideas on improving the process, we hope you'll
7 take the opportunity between now and the old deadline
8 of November 1st. As Tom mentioned, this may be
9 extended to December 2nd. Hopefully we have more
10 information on that tomorrow.

11
12 To help guide any public testimony, I'm
13 going to leave these questions up. So this is the main
14 points that we would like to have the public comments
15 focus on. I'll leave it at that.

16
17 Thank you.

18
19 MR. KRON: Thank you, Trevor. Again,
20 we're going to basically, once we get into the public
21 comments, Charlie and I are just going to listen.
22 We're going to listen to your comments. The court
23 reporter will transcribe them for us and for you.
24 Again, we wanted to take just a few minutes if people
25 have any questions about the presentation that Trevor
26 gave. Maybe Kathy and Trevor and I will try our best
27 to answer them if you have them. Please just stand up
28 and come up if you have any questions.

29
30 MS. GOMEZ: I just wanted to know if
31 you guys are using the regulations.gov website for the
32 online public comment docket. I didn't see that as an
33 option. It's a really useful website that a lot of the
34 Federal agencies use. If it's possible if you
35 guys.....

36
37 (Microphone turned off)

38
39 MS. O'REILLY-DOYLE: I don't know why
40 we didn't do it and the Federal Register notice is in
41 right now to do the amendment or else we would take
42 that under consideration, but we're hoping it's going
43 to be published tomorrow.

44
45 But thank you.

46
47 MR. KRON: Any other questions.

48
49 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I just had a quick
50 question about the census data that you had pulled up.

1 Did you pull up the 2000 census data and not the 2010
2 census data because it was the last determination that
3 you're talking about? How come it wasn't the most
4 recent census data?

5

6 MR. FOX: Yes, that was put up there
7 because that's when the last determinations were based
8 off of.

9

10 MR. KRON: Any other questions.

11

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I have a question.
13 So the communities that have one school, are you
14 combining those communities? Say if Aleknagik and
15 Dillingham went over 2,500, would that mean that
16 they're urban?

17

18 MS. O'REILLY-DOYLE: Do you want to
19 flip back to the last slide. I think this would help
20 if we had the slide up there.

21

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, go back to
23 the slide.

24

25 MS. O'REILLY-DOYLE: There we go. So
26 you're questioning on this one.....

27

28 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

29

30 MS. O'REILLY-DOYLE:in terms of
31 rural characteristics. So between the 2,500 and 7,000,
32 these are the rural characteristics that the Board
33 would use because under that 2,500 is determined to be
34 rural. Over is nonrural. Then, for the in between
35 ones, these are the characteristics, so they're all
36 used in combination. These are all factors that the
37 Board would consider.

38

39 So just because there's an educational
40 institution, there's other things that are going to
41 influence the Board's decision or have in the past.
42 That's why the Board is opening this up, you know, in
43 terms of rural characteristics. They're asking do you
44 want us to continue to use these or are there other
45 things we should use or is there a better way to make
46 that determination.

47

48 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

49

50 MR. DUNAWAY: So in this process here,

1 is there a scoring system or is it -- what's done with
2 under infrastructure? Airport, check. Highway, no.

3
4 MR. KRON: What was presented here was
5 generally the way the Board has done it before and
6 they're asking you in each case is this the way they
7 should do it. How should Charlie look at this when
8 it's decided next time. Are there other factors. Are
9 there some of these they shouldn't use. Again, they're
10 asking for your input.

11
12 So, Dan, if you have a perspective of
13 some of these that make sense, some that you'd like to
14 add, now is your chance to say so.

15
16 Any other comments or questions. Yeah.

17
18 MR. ANDREW: I have a question on the
19 previous slide. You have the grouping of communities
20 or something like that.

21
22 MS. O'REILLY-DOYLE: Oh, aggregation.

23
24 MR. ANDREW: I'm at the beginning of
25 your presentation and I'm wondering in the regions,
26 when you're grouping communities, how many communities
27 are you considering?

28
29 MR. KRON: Again, basically the Board
30 would like your perspective on this. Should they group
31 communities. Should the current Board group
32 communities and, if so, what kinds of characteristics
33 should they consider to make a group. So they're
34 asking you what you think makes sense. Things haven't
35 been decided at this point. Go ahead.

36
37 MR. ANDREW: I wouldn't agree with it
38 basically because you're going to be increasing the
39 population on that. If you're grouping the community.
40 The danger is if you're going to be grouping let's say
41 five villages, we're going to lose our rural identity
42 in that situation and I wouldn't go for that.

43
44 MR. FOX: Yeah, just to respond to
45 that. So that's basically what we're looking for, is
46 some comment on the process. So this is what the Board
47 is asking. Are these grouping criteria useful for
48 determining rural and nonrural. If you think not, then
49 providing those ideas and what you just said, you know,
50 that's what we're looking for as a public comment on

1 how to better this process.

2

3 MS. O'REILLY-DOYLE: If I can add to
4 that too. If you came in late, it was explained that
5 what we'll do first is a presentation so everybody
6 understands what the Board is asking for and then we do
7 have the comment sheets available. If you fill one of
8 these out, then what we'll do after the presentation
9 here is then we're going to do the public comment. So
10 we'd encourage you to come up and talk about your
11 concerns on that. You can do it today or you can do it
12 tomorrow at the Council meeting. Your choice, but we
13 have it available to you tonight.

14

15 MR. ANDREW: It sounds like I could
16 also do it in writing.

17

18 MS. O'REILLY-DOYLE: You can do both.
19 Either way or both. Would you like me to bring you one
20 of these.

21

22 MR. ANDREW: Thank you.

23

24 MR. KRON: So I'll ask again, any other
25 questions.

26

27 (No comments)

28

29 MR. KRON: Seeing none. Kathy, do we
30 have any of these yet?

31

32 MR. WOODS: One short question.

33

34 MR. KRON: Yeah, go ahead.

35

36 MR. WOODS: Me and you know that
37 earlier this month, I think the 12th through the 16th
38 the joint Boards met and reviewed the same criteria for
39 the State side. In the beginning of this, did you
40 adopt a part of that 13 criteria the Subsistence
41 Division utilizes for their process? It looked like a
42 pretty bullet-proof process.

43

44 It's like we're dually managed and then
45 we're dually processing or we're dually -- you're
46 making me live in two different arenas and two
47 different worlds as a subsistence user trying to keep
48 track of both. Like the RAC is trying to coordinate
49 all the regulations so it's user friendly for everyone.
50 When I seen the 202-page report that Jim Fall did on

1 the non-subsistence use areas that you listed the black
2 dots on your map, it was almost bullet-proof. I know
3 you don't want to duplicate that process, but do you
4 understand what I'm saying?

5
6 I'm trying to keep it simple as
7 possible because as a subsistence user and trying to go
8 through this process in each community that has to go
9 through this process is going to have to have a State
10 determination on one side and then a rural
11 determination on the other -- I mean a Federal
12 determination on the other side. Of course, those
13 proposals failed and the listing that was here
14 addressed that. I know you're looking at both. You
15 know what I'm trying to say?

16
17 MS. O'REILLY-DOYLE: If I could just
18 add those are the kind of comments the Board would like
19 to hear, so if you'd like to take an opportunity to
20 come up.....

21
22 MR. WOODS: I will.

23
24 MS. O'REILLY-DOYLE:and make the
25 comment at the microphone. It will be important and
26 transcribed.

27
28 MR. KRON: Maybe I can respond very
29 briefly. Again, this process is based on ANILCA and
30 it's the Federal Board that's making the determination.
31 Again, we were very well aware of the issues that the
32 State joint Boards were addressing for Bethel and
33 Kodiak for example. Again, this is a different
34 process. It's a Federal process and it's a rural
35 determination process that Charlie and the other Board
36 members will be engaging in and they are asking for
37 your perspective on how to do it. How should they do
38 it.

39
40 Trevor went through an explanation of
41 the things that they've used in the past. Again, as he
42 asked, we're asking, the Board is asking how do you
43 guys and gals want the Federal Board to address this.
44 So, again, it's a different process, but, again, there
45 are definite implications.

46
47 Thank you.

48
49 Again, at any time during this if you
50 feel compelled to say something, please get a card from

1 Kathy. We're asking people to fill these out just so
2 we can make sure we've got everybody's name, we know
3 what their affiliation is and from what basis they're
4 talking. So, Frank Woods.

5
6 MR. WOODS: Oh, jeez.

7
8 (Laughter)

9
10 MR. WOODS: Well, you wanted me to
11 comment. I guess I'll comment. Frank Woods. Like I
12 said before, as a Federally qualified subsistence user
13 in the zip code 99576, I am overwhelmed by having to
14 defend everything I do from the legal standpoint of
15 subsistence. It's getting tiresome, to put it lightly,
16 to defend myself in the legal department of regulation
17 and then to have to hear people having to defend
18 themselves all over the state on the legislative side
19 and every legal battle that comes up.

20
21 You know, from enforcement to
22 regulation to ADF&G side, to the Federal side, to
23 always defending the subsistence lifestyle. It seems
24 like just about in every arena, from the press, to the
25 ADF&G boards, AC process, to the RAC process, to the
26 Federal Subsistence Board. We're the only user group
27 that has to defend our traditional way of life of
28 having a regulation. We're just trying to keep what we
29 have.

30
31 If you're using a population census, at
32 Statehood we had barely enough people to become a
33 state. At that time my belief is that we had enough
34 resources to share with everybody. Now we're hitting a
35 threshold. We're almost at 730,000 at last count.
36 Almost three-quarter of a million. Like I said in my
37 earlier testimony to the RAC, the balloon effect of the
38 big communities is overspilling that use into the rural
39 communities.

40
41 Ninety percent of the resources come
42 out of rural Alaska. I guarantee you not even half
43 that money goes back into managing that resource. The
44 money that gets made from rural Alaska is never coming
45 back in. On the Federal side and the State side. I
46 looked at a budget of \$11.5 million. I wish I had that
47 resource, a tenth of it to manage resource in Bristol
48 Bay.

49
50 The 13 characteristics the State went

1 through in a 202-page report that Jim Fall did outlined
2 the 13 characteristics. It looked like it was really
3 well detailed and bullet-proof. I'd ask you to look at
4 that document as a living document at the joint Boards
5 October 12th through the 16th. In that process, it
6 outlined just what you did. It's a longer list. It
7 looked a little more detailed. Not trying to duplicate
8 stuff. My day job is to disseminate both State and
9 Federal regulation to match the use in our area.

10

11 When I sit down to talk to people, I'm
12 talking a different language almost. When they sit
13 there and talk about Federal regulation, State
14 regulation and regulatory process, it's like a language
15 that people don't want to -- it's almost like you're a
16 burden to them to have to sit down and listen to you.
17 I'll be frank since my name is Frank.

18

19 (Laughter)

20

21 MR. WOODS: It's hard to educate and
22 keep people interested in this process. As you see,
23 there's a limited amount of people actually showing up.
24 What I'd ask you to do is really be careful. The next
25 time you advertise this stuff is that we need a little
26 more -- I know we had a shutdown and we're here. You
27 know, I always tease Ted, our subsistence ADF&G
28 specialist, what his mission statement is. What is
29 your mission statement? I'll ask you that.

30

31 MR. KRON: My mission statement is to
32 adhere to ANILCA and to provide for the protections for
33 the rural uses that are in ANILCA.

34

35 MR. WOODS: Thank you. The rural
36 preference subsistence priority in this whole system,
37 the Federal Subsistence Board, the OSM, the FSB -- I
38 can go on and on about the acronym, but I really
39 appreciate -- Alaska, rural Alaska and Native people
40 need this process. They need it to the extent that
41 that's the only thing that's going to protect them to
42 continue the lifestyle that they live.

43

44 I really am grateful the State of
45 Alaska is an open process, but the flaw is they have a
46 different mandate and that mandates all Alaskans. It
47 isn't discriminatory and it isn't -- we're not trying
48 to conflict the two. On a ground level, all of us work
49 together.

50

1 At administrative level, your level and
2 ADF&G side, I keep telling them we need to sit at the
3 table and talk things out because the users are getting
4 affected. Users are suffering from the administrative
5 and the higher-ups at a 3,000-foot level you guys may
6 operate at are having conflicts. The State is suing
7 the Feds, the Feds are having to defend themselves.
8 There's turf wars that I don't even want to get into
9 with the Federal Subsistence Board or, you know, going
10 on down at the superior court. You just mentioned the
11 definition of rural by the Supreme Court. That's
12 something we don't want to get into. We just want to
13 continue.

14
15 So I really advise you to look at that
16 document. I tried to download it. I have it at work.
17 I have the full document on my computer somewhere, but
18 I spent all day here, so I couldn't access any of that
19 stuff.

20
21 I really appreciate -- good to see
22 Charlie here and your efforts are really appreciated.
23 The new guys, welcome to the club. Guaranteed, by the
24 time you get done, misery loves company and we're all
25 here at 7:40 at night. I'll shut up. Thanks.

26
27 MR. KRON: Okay. The next testimony is
28 from Bobby Andrew.

29
30 MR. ANDREW: Thank you. As introduced,
31 I'm Bobby Andrew, president of Aleknagik Natives,
32 Limited. Aleknagik being only 23 miles away from
33 Dillingham and my big concern is if Aleknagik is
34 grouped with a couple of other communities that's going
35 to be increasing the population probably over 2,500.
36 If it's grouped with another village besides
37 Dillingham, that would probably bring us up quite a
38 ways. With the population that eventually will grow,
39 we're going to lose that rural identity.

40
41 In addition to that, your population
42 thresholds, as the slide shows, some of the villages
43 may exceed 7,000 in the state. Probably like in the
44 situation of the Bethel area. When I look at rural, I
45 look at rural where there's no access by road. Only by
46 air or by boat.

47
48 I agree with the 10-year timeline. In
49 many of the villages in the region here, the residents,
50 not only the Native community, it's also the non-Native

1 community that utilizes the fish and wildlife.
2
3 I think what you should also do is take
4 a look at the population threshold if you're going to
5 be moving to group some of the villages by increasing
6 the 7,000, the top. Thanks.
7
8 MS. O'REILLY-DOYLE: Bobby, can I ask
9 you a question. Are you speaking on behalf of yourself
10 or the village?
11
12 MR. ANDREW: Both.
13
14 MS. O'REILLY-DOYLE: Okay. Can you put
15 that on the record.
16
17 MR. ANDREW: Okay. I'm representing
18 myself as well as the Village of Aleknagik.
19
20 MR. KRON: Thank you, Bobby. I guess
21 we have people on the teleconference, I think. I would
22 ask if there's anyone from the telephone that would
23 like to testify, anyone there.
24
25 (No comments)
26
27 MR. KRON: Okay. We'll go back to the
28 room. I've got these two cards. Does anyone else want
29 to testify in addition to Frank and Bobby?
30
31 (No comments)
32
33 MR. KRON: Okay. Back to the
34 telephone. Anyone there that wants to testify.
35
36 (No comments)
37
38 MS. STICKMAN: I just have one comment.
39
40 MR. KRON: Come on up.
41
42 MS. STICKMAN: Hello. My name is
43 Danielle Stickman and I'm representing myself. I would
44 like the Board to include -- it says the communities
45 that are economically, socially and communally
46 integrated are considered in the aggregate. I would
47 like you to consider including cultural aspects as well
48 because there's a series of bartering and trading and
49 sharing.
50

1 A lot of people come from urban areas
2 to come back and hunt, not just non-Natives, but also
3 -- well, people move away and then they come back to
4 subsist. One animal could go far. I mean Charlie
5 knows. Whales, it goes all over the state and goes all
6 over the region, even just one moose.

7
8 I assisted in a moose harvest and it
9 didn't go to one family. It went to a lot of families
10 and that's a really good thing to consider because a
11 lot of urban people who go out sport hunting, that's
12 just for, in my preference from what I've known, is it
13 goes towards one family. The cultural aspect is such a
14 strong point for all Alaska Natives, so I think that
15 should be considered.

16
17 Thank you.

18
19 MR. KRON: Thank you, Danielle. Anyone
20 else. It's your opportunity to provide comments.
21 Again, you can provide written comments after this
22 hearing or there will be an opportunity again in the
23 morning when the Regional Advisory Council reconvenes.

24
25 MR. WOODS: You're going to fill the
26 room tomorrow.

27
28 (Laughter)

29
30 MR. KRON: Back to the phone one more
31 time. Anyone who would like to testify.

32
33 (No comments)

34
35 MR. KRON: Okay. I think we've taken
36 the testimony that people brought that they wanted to
37 present today. Again, tomorrow will be another
38 opportunity in the morning when the Regional Advisory
39 Council considers this issue.

40
41 Thank you all for coming. Don't leave
42 quite yet. I've got a little section here I need to go
43 over. I've called all the people who indicated on a
44 speaker card that they desired to make oral comments.
45 Is there anyone I've inadvertently missed or omitted.

46
47 (No comments)

48
49 MR. KRON: I'm looking up again. I'm
50 not hearing or seeing a hand up. There being no

1 further comments, I will close the meeting. You may
2 submit written comments after this meeting and, again,
3 the current deadline is November 1st, but we expect
4 that this will be expanded to the 2nd of December.

5
6 All the addresses and instructions for
7 submitting comments were included in the handouts and
8 the presentation and on the website.

9
10 Thank you all very much for coming to
11 participate in the process tonight.

12
13 The Federal Subsistence Board is
14 looking forward to the comments on this issue from the
15 tribes, ANCSA corporations and the general public.
16 After all comments are received and evaluated, then the
17 process moves into phase two where the Board may craft
18 recommendations on the rural determination criteria to
19 forward to the Secretaries of the Interior and
20 Agriculture.

21
22 Thank you for coming tonight.

23
24 (Off record)

25
26 (END OF PROCEEDINGS)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

C E R T I F I C A T E

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)
)ss.
STATE OF ALASKA)

I, Salena A. Hile, Notary Public, State of Alaska and reporter for Computer Matrix Court Reporters, LLC do hereby certify:

THAT the foregoing pages numbered 2 through 19 contain a full, true and correct Transcript of PUBLIC HEARING IN RE: FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE BOARD RURAL DETERMINATION PROCESS, taken electronically by Computer Matrix Court Reporters on the 29th day of October in Anchorage, Alaska;

THAT the transcript is a true and correct transcript requested to be transcribed and thereafter transcribed under my direction to the best of our knowledge and ability;

THAT I am not an employee, attorney, or party interested in any way in this action.

DATED at Anchorage, Alaska, this 18th day of November 2013.

Salena A. Hile
Notary Public, State of Alaska
My Commission Expires: 9/16/14